

Systèmes dynamiques /Dynamical systems

On convergence of generalized continued fractions and Ramanujan's conjecture

A.A.Glutsyuk

Abstract

We consider continued fractions

$$\frac{-a_1}{1 - \frac{a_2}{1 - \frac{a_3}{1 - \dots}}} \quad (0.1)$$

with real coefficients a_i converging to a limit a . S.Ramanujan had stated the theorem (see [ABJL], p.38) saying that if $a \neq \frac{1}{4}$, then the fraction converges if and only if $a < \frac{1}{4}$. The statement of convergence was proved in [V] for complex a_i converging to $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\frac{1}{4}, +\infty)$ (see also [P]). J.Gill [G] proved the divergence of (0.1) under the assumption that $a_i \rightarrow a > \frac{1}{4}$ fast enough, more precisely, whenever

$$\sum_i |a_i - a| < \infty. \quad (0.2)$$

The Ramanujan's conjecture saying that (0.1) diverges always whenever $a_i \rightarrow a > \frac{1}{4}$ remained up to now an open question. In the present paper we disprove it. We show (Theorem 1.1) that for any $a > \frac{1}{4}$ there exists a real sequence $a_i \rightarrow a$ such that (0.1) converges¹. Moreover, we show (Theorem 1.2) that Gill's sufficient divergence condition (0.2) is the optimal condition on the speed of convergence of the a_i 's.

Sur convergence des fractions continues généralisées et une conjecture de Ramanujan

Résumé. Nous considérons une fraction continue

$$\frac{-a_1}{1 - \frac{a_2}{1 - \frac{a_3}{1 - \dots}}} \quad (0.1)$$

à coefficients réels $a_i \rightarrow a$. S.Ramanujan a formulé le théorème (voir [ABJL], p.38), qui disait, que si $a \neq \frac{1}{4}$, alors la fraction converge, si et seulement si $a < \frac{1}{4}$. La convergence a été démontrée dans [V] pour a_i complexes convergeant vers un $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\frac{1}{4}, +\infty)$ (voir aussi [P]). J.Gill [G] a démontré, que la fraction diverge, si $a_i \rightarrow a > \frac{1}{4}$ assez vite, plus précisément, si $\sum_i |a_i - a| < \infty$.

La conjecture de Ramanujan disant que la fraction diverge toujours, quand $a > \frac{1}{4}$, restait ouverte jusqu'au présent. Nous montrons, qu'elle est fausse: pour tout $a > \frac{1}{4}$ il existe une suite réelle $a_i \rightarrow a$ telle que la fraction converge (Théorème 1.1). Nous montrons aussi, que la condition précédente de Gill, qui est suffisante pour que la fraction diverge, est celle optimale sur la vitesse de convergence des a_i .

¹The author acknowledges that Alexey Tsygvintsev has constructed (by a completely different method) a beautiful explicit example [Ts] of a sequence $a_i \rightarrow 1$ given by a simple recurrent formula. This example comes from the analytic function theory

Version française abrégée

Théorème 1.1. Pour tout $a > \frac{1}{4}$ il existe une suite $a_i \rightarrow a$, telle que la fraction (0.1) converge.

Théorème 1.2. Étant donnés un $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \geq 3$, et une suite $r_i \rightarrow 0$, $r_i > 0$, telle que $\sum_i r_i = \infty$. Alors il existe toujours un $a > \frac{1}{4}$ et une suite

$$a_i \rightarrow a, \quad a_i = a, \text{ si } i \not\equiv 1, 2 \pmod{q}, \quad a_{qi+1} - a = O(r_i), a_{qi+2} - a = O(r_i), \text{ quand } i \rightarrow \infty,$$

telle que la fraction (0.1) converge.

1 Main results and the plan of the paper

1.1 Main results

1.1 Theorem *For any $a > \frac{1}{4}$ there exists a real sequence $a_i \rightarrow a$ such that the continued fraction (0.1) converges.*

1.2 Theorem *Given any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \geq 3$, and a sequence $r_i \rightarrow 0$, $r_i > 0$, such that*

$$\sum_i r_i = \infty. \tag{1.1}$$

Then there exists an $a > \frac{1}{4}$ and a real sequence

$$a_i \rightarrow a, \quad a_i = a, \text{ if } i \not\equiv 1, 2 \pmod{q}, \quad a_{qi+1} - a = O(r_i), a_{qi+2} - a = O(r_i), \text{ as } i \rightarrow \infty, \tag{1.2}$$

such that the continued fraction (0.1) converges.

1.2 The plan of the proofs and generalizations

In the proof of Theorem 1.1 we use the following expression of continued fraction (0.1) as a limit of compositions of Möbius transformations of the closed upper half-plane $H = \{Imz \geq 0\}$. For any $b \in \mathbb{R}$ define the Möbius transformation

$$T_b : H \rightarrow H, \quad T_b(z) = -\frac{b}{z+1}.$$

1.3 Proposition *The subsequent ratios $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$ of the continued fraction (0.1) are given by the formula*

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} = \tau_n = T_{a_1} \circ \cdots \circ T_{a_n}(0). \tag{1.3}$$

The Proposition is well-known and follows immediately from definition (by induction in n).

Recall the following

1.4 Definition A Möbius transformation $M : H \rightarrow H$ of the upper half-plane is said to be *elliptic* (respectively, *hyperbolic*), if it has a fixed point in $\text{Int}(H)$ (respectively, two fixed points on the boundary of H : then one of them is attractor, the other one is repeller). (Each elliptic element is Möbius conjugated to a rotation of unit disc. By definition, its *rotation number* is $(2\pi)^{-1}$ times the corresponding rotation angle.) The *multiplier* of a hyperbolic transformation T (denoted $\mu = \mu(T)$) is its derivative at the attractor (by definition, $0 < \mu < 1$).

1.5 Remark The transformation T_a is elliptic if and only if $a > \frac{1}{4}$. The function $a \mapsto \rho(a)$, whose value is the rotation number of T_a , is an analytic diffeomorphism $(\frac{1}{4}, +\infty) \rightarrow (0, \frac{1}{2})$. The function $a \mapsto c(a)$ whose value is the fixed point of T_a in H is an analytic diffeomorphism $(\frac{1}{4}, +\infty) \rightarrow i\mathbb{R}_+ - \frac{1}{2}$. One has

$$\rho(1) = \frac{1}{3},$$

since T_1 permutes cyclically 0, 1 and ∞ . If $\rho(a) = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $T_a^q = Id$.

1.6 Example Let $a_i \equiv a > \frac{1}{4}$. Then $\tau_n = T_a^n(0)$ does not have a limit: this is either periodic or a quasiperiodic sequence.

1.7 Theorem *Theorem 1.1 holds for each a with $\rho(a) \in \mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, given any smooth elliptic transformation family $\{T_a\}_{a \in \mathbb{R}} : H \rightarrow H$ with a smooth fixed point family $c(a)$. Let a be a parameter value such that $\rho(a) = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0, \frac{1}{2}\}$ and $c'(a) \neq 0$. Then there exists a sequence $a_i \rightarrow a$ such that the corresponding sequence τ_n from (1.3) converges. For any given diverging series $\sum_i r_i = \infty$, $r_i \rightarrow 0_+$, the sequence a_i can be chosen to satisfy (1.2).*

1.8 Theorem *Theorem 1.1 holds for each a with $\rho(a) \notin \mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, let T_a be an elliptic transformation family as in Theorem 1.7. Let a be a parameter value such that $\rho(a) \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and $\rho \not\equiv \text{const}$ near a . Then there exists a sequence $a_i \rightarrow a$ such that τ_n converge.*

Theorems 1.7 and 1.8 imply Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.7 implies Theorem 1.2. It is proved in the next Section. Theorem 1.8 is proved in Section 3.

2 Limits with rational $\rho(a)$. Proof of Theorem 1.7

Let $\rho(a) = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}$, thus, $T_a^q = Id$. We choose appropriate sequences $\alpha_r, \beta_r \rightarrow a$ as specified below and put

$$a_i = a \text{ if } i \not\equiv 1, 2 \pmod{q}; \quad a_{qr+1} = \alpha_r, \quad a_{qr+2} = \beta_r. \quad \text{Denote} \quad (2.1)$$

$$T_{\alpha, \beta, q} = T_\alpha \circ T_\beta \circ T_a^{q-2}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad \text{We choose } \alpha_r, \beta_r \text{ so that}$$

$$T_{\alpha_r, \beta_r, q} \text{ be hyperbolic, denote } A_r, R_r \text{ their attractors (respectively, repellers),} \quad (2.2)$$

$$A_i \rightarrow A, R_i \rightarrow R, \quad A \neq R, \quad R \notin C_a = \{T_a^l(0), l = 0, \dots, q-1\}, \quad (2.3)$$

$$\prod_r \mu_r = 0, \quad \mu_r = \mu(T_{\alpha_r, \beta_r, q}). \quad (2.4)$$

The possibility of the above choice of α_r, β_r is proved at the end of the Section.

Below we show (the next Proposition and the paragraph after) that the corresponding sequence τ_n converges, whenever conditions (2.2)-(2.4) hold.

2.1 Proposition *Let $H_1, H_2, \dots$ be an arbitrary sequence of hyperbolic transformations $H \rightarrow H$ of the upper half-plane, A_i, R_i be respectively their attractors and repellers, $A_i \rightarrow A, R_i \rightarrow R \neq A$. Let (2.4) hold with $\mu_r = \mu(H_r)$. Then the mapping sequence $\hat{H}_n = H_1 \circ \dots \circ H_n$ converges uniformly to a constant mapping on compact sets in $\partial H \setminus R$.*

Proof If $A_i = A, R_i = R$, then the statement of the Proposition follows immediately. If we fix a compact set $K \Subset \partial H \setminus \{A \cup R\}$, then for any i large enough the transformation H_i moves the points of K towards A (along ∂H) by asymptotically the same distance, as the hyperbolic transformation with the same multiplier μ_i but with $A_i = A, R_i = R$. This together with the previous statement and the monotonicity of the restrictions $H_i|_{\partial H}$ implies the Proposition. $\square$

2.1 Proof of convergence of τ_n

If (2.2)-(2.4) hold, then the transformations $H_r = T_{\alpha_r, \beta_r, q}$ satisfy the conditions of the previous Proposition. Hence, their compositions $\hat{H}_r = T_{\alpha_1} \circ T_{\alpha_2} \circ \dots \circ T_{\alpha_{qr}}$ converge uniformly to a constant limit (denote it x) on compact sets in $\partial H \setminus R$. By definition, $\tau_{qr} = \hat{H}_r(0)$, $0 \neq R$ by (2.3). This implies that $\tau_{qr} \rightarrow x$, as $r \rightarrow \infty$. To show that the whole sequence τ_n converges to x , we use condition (2.3), which says that the finite T_a - orbit C_a of 0 does not meet R . Let us take a $\delta > 0$ so that the closed δ - neighborhood U of the latter orbit be disjoint from R . Then $\hat{H}_r \rightarrow x$ uniformly on U . If r is large enough, then

$$T_{\alpha_r}(0), T_{\alpha_r} \circ T_{\beta_r}(0), T_{\alpha_r} \circ T_{\beta_r} \circ T_a^{l-2}(0) \in U \quad (0 < l \leq q). \text{ By definition,}$$

$$\tau_{qr+1} = \hat{H}_r \circ T_{\alpha_r}(0), \tau_{qr+l} = \hat{H}_r \circ T_{\alpha_r} \circ T_{\beta_r} \circ T_a^{l-2}(0).$$

The two last statements imply together that the q sequences $\tau_{qr}, \tau_{qr+1}, \tau_{qr+2}, \dots, \tau_{qr+q-1}$ converge to x , hence, the whole sequence τ_n converges. Theorem 1.7 is proved.

2.2 The construction of sequences α_i, β_i satisfying (2.2)-(2.4)

2.2 Lemma (Main Technical Lemma). *Let a family T_a and a parameter value a be as in Theorem 1.7. Then for any point $R \in \partial H$ (maybe except two points) there exist two linear families of parameter values*

$$\alpha(t) = a + c_1 t, \quad \beta(t) = a + c_2 t, \quad c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.5)$$

such that for any $t > 0$ small enough the transformation $T_{\alpha(t), \beta(t), q} = T_{\alpha(t)} \circ T_{\beta(t)} \circ T_a^{q-2}$ be hyperbolic and its repeller $R(t)$ (respectively, attractor $A(t)$) tends to R (respectively, to a point $A \neq R$), as $t \rightarrow 0_+$. Moreover, one can achieve that the families $A(t), R(t)$ be smooth at 0, and the derivative in t at $t = 0$ of the previous family $T_{\alpha(t), \beta(t), q}$ be nonzero.

The Lemma is proved below.

Let $\rho(a) = \frac{p}{q}$, C_a be the (finite) T_a - orbit of 0. Let us choose any $R \notin C_a$ that satisfies the statements of Lemma 2.2. Let $\alpha(t)$, $\beta(t)$ be the corresponding families (2.5). Take a sequence $t_k \rightarrow 0_+$ and put $\alpha_k = \alpha(t_k)$, $\beta_k = \beta(t_k)$. The conditions (2.2) and (2.3) follow immediately from construction. Condition (2.4) holds, if and only if $\sum t_i = \infty$ (these are the t_i we choose). This follows from the fact that the function $\mu(t) = \mu(T_{\alpha(t), \beta(t), q})$ has nonzero derivative at 0: $\mu(t) = 1 + st + O(t^2)$, $s \neq 0$, hence, $\ln \mu_k = -st_k(1 + o(1))$. Indeed, otherwise, if $\mu'(0) = 0$, the transformation family $T_{\alpha(t), \beta(t), q}$ would have zero derivative in t at $t = 0$ - a contradiction to the last statement of the Lemma. This finishes the construction. Statement (1.2) follows immediately, if we put $t_i = r_i$. Theorem 1.7 is proved.

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Consider $T_{\alpha, \beta, q} = T_\alpha \circ T_\beta \circ T_a^{q-2}$ as a family of mappings depending on two variable parameters α and β (the a is fixed). It is identity, if $\alpha, \beta = a$. Consider its derivative in α at $(\alpha, \beta) = (a, a)$ (which is a vector field on ∂H denoted v_1). Its derivative in β at the same point is another vector field $v_2 = (T_a)_* v_1$ that is the image of v_1 under the diffeomorphism $T_a : \partial H \rightarrow \partial H$. We claim that the fields v_1 and v_2 are not constant-proportional. Indeed, otherwise the group generated by T_a and the 1-parametric subgroup in $Aut(H)$ generated by v_1 would be solvable. Since T_a is elliptic, this implies that T_a either belongs to the same 1-parameter subgroup, or is an involution. The first case is impossible: otherwise the centers $c(a)$ would have zero derivatives at a - a contradiction to the conditions of the Lemma. The second case is impossible by the hypothesis $\rho(a) \neq 0, \frac{1}{2}$.

Thus, the vector fields v_1 and v_2 are not proportional. Hence, for any point $R \in \partial H$ one can find a linear combination $v = c_1 v_1 + c_2 v_2 \neq 0$ that vanishes at R . If the 1-jet of v at R does not vanish (then one can achieve that $v'(R) > 0$ by changing sign), this implies that v has another zero $A \in \partial H \setminus R$. Then the corresponding families (2.5) are those we are looking for. If the latter 1-jet vanishes, this implies that the commutator $[v_1, v_2]$ (which also belongs to the Lie algebra of the group $Aut(H)$) vanishes at R . The latter commutator does not vanish identically (since v_i are not proportional) and cannot have more than two zeros. This together with the previous discussion proves the Lemma $\square$

3 Case of irrational limit rotation. Proof of Theorem 1.8.

Let $\rho(a) \notin \mathbb{Q}$, $\tilde{a}_n \rightarrow a$, $\rho(\tilde{a}_n) = \frac{p_n}{q_n} \in \mathbb{Q}$. We choose appropriate $\alpha_n, \beta_n \rightarrow a$, a natural number sequence $N_1, N_2, \dots$, and define a_n as follows:

- 1) Let $n \leq N_1 q_1$. Put $a_n = \tilde{a}_1$, if $n \not\equiv 1, 2 \pmod{q_1}$; $a_{q_1 r + 1} = \alpha_1$, $a_{q_1 r + 2} = \beta_1$, $r < N_1$.
- 2) Let $N_1 q_1 < n \leq N_1 q_1 + N_2 q_2$. Put $n_1 = n - N_1 q_1$, $a_n = \tilde{a}_2$, if $n_1 \not\equiv 1, 2 \pmod{q_2}$; $a_n = \alpha_2$, if $n_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{q_2}$; $a_n = \beta_2$, if $n_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{q_2}$, etc.

We show that (0.1) converges if we take α_i , β_i and N_i as specified below.

Choice of α_n and β_n . Denote

$$\psi_0 = \psi_{n,0} = Id, \psi_n = T_{\alpha_n, \beta_n, q_n} = T_{\alpha_n} \circ T_{\beta_n} \circ T_{a_n}^{q_n-2}, \psi_{n,1} = T_{\alpha_n}, \psi_{n,2} = \psi_{n,1} \circ T_{\beta_n},$$

$\psi_{n,l} = \psi_{n,2} \circ T_{a_n}^{l-2}$, for $2 \leq l \leq q_n - 1$. We choose α_n and β_n so that the transformations

$$\psi_n \text{ be hyperbolic, denote } A_n, R_n \text{ their attractors (respectively, repellers),} \quad (3.1)$$

$$R_n \notin M_n = \{A_{n+1}, \psi_{n+1,l}(A_{n+1}), 0, \psi_{n+1}^r \circ \psi_{n+1,l}(0) \mid 0 \leq l \leq q_{n+1} - 1, r \in \mathbb{N} \cup 0\} \quad (3.2)$$

3.1 Remark The previous set M_n is infinite and accumulates exactly to the finite $T_{\tilde{a}_n}$ -orbit of A_{n+1} , which follows from definition. This implies that if (3.2) holds, then M_n does not accumulate to R_n . Thus, in this case choosing appropriate power N_n , one can achieve that the image $\psi_n^{N_n}(M_n)$ be arbitrarily close to A_n .

Choice of N_i . Let α_i, β_i be already chosen to satisfy (3.1) and (3.2). Denote

$$\theta_k = \psi_1^{N_1} \circ \dots \circ \psi_k^{N_k}.$$

We construct N_i (by induction in i) in such a way that

$$\text{diam}(\theta_k(M_k)) < \frac{1}{2^k}. \quad (3.3)$$

The possibility to do this follows immediately from the last statement of the previous Remark. Let us show that then the sequence τ_n is Cauchy (hence, converges). Denote $n_k = \sum_{i=1}^k q_i N_i$. It suffices to show that

$$\text{for any } k \text{ and any } m \geq n_k \text{ one has } \text{dist}(\tau_{n_k}, \tau_m) < \frac{1}{2^{k-2}}. \quad (3.4)$$

Case 1: $m = n_i > n_k$, say, $m = n_{k+1}$. Then $\tau_{n_k} = \theta_k(0)$, $\tau_m = \theta_{k+1}(0) = \theta_k \circ \psi_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}}(0)$. By definition, $0, \psi_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}}(0) \in M_k$. By (3.3), $\text{dist}(\theta_k(0), \theta_{k+1}(0)) = \text{dist}(\theta_k(0), \theta_k(\psi_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}}(0))) < \frac{1}{2^k}$.

$$\text{Therefore, } \text{dist}(\theta_k(0), \theta_s(0)) < \frac{1}{2^{k-1}} \text{ for any } s > k. \quad (3.5)$$

This proves (3.4) for any $m = n_i > n_k$.

General case: $m > n_k$ is arbitrary. Take $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$n_s \leq m < n_{s+1}. \text{ Then } m = n_s + r q_{s+1} + l, \ 0 \leq l < q_{s+1}, \ \tau_m = \theta_s \circ \psi_{s+1}^{r-1} \circ \psi_{s+1, l}(0).$$

Analogously to the previous discussion, by (3.3), $\text{dist}(\theta_s(0), \tau_m) < \frac{1}{2^s}$. This together with (3.5) implies (3.4). Theorem 1.8 is proved.

4 Acknowledgements

The author is grateful to A.Tsygvintsev for attracting his attention to the problem and for helpful discussions.

5 Bibliography

[ABJL] G.E.Andrews, B.C.Berndt, L.Jacobsen, R.L.Lamphere. - The continued fractions found in the unorganized portions of Ramanujan's notebooks. - Memoirs of the AMS, vol. 99 (1992), No 477.

[G] J.Gill, Infinite composition of Möbius transformations, - Trans. Amer. Math. Society, 176 (1973), 479-487.

[P] O.Perron, Die Lehre von den Kettenbrüchen, - Band 2, dritte Auf., B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1957.

[Ts] A.Tsygvintsev. On the convergence of continued fractions at Runckel's points and the Ramanujan conjecture. - Preprint <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.FA/0412298>

[V] E.B.Van Vleck, On the convergence of algebraic continued fractions whose coefficients have limiting values. - Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 5 (1904), 253-262.

CNRS, Unité de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, M.R., École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France

E-mail address: aglutsyu@umpa.ens-lyon.fr